

Hindy Najman and Eibert Tigchelaar

What's in a name? that which we call a rose
By any other name would smell as sweet;
So Romeo would, were he not Romeo call'd,
Retain that dear perfection which he owes
Without that title. Romeo, doff thy name,
And for that name which is no part of thee
Take all myself.

Romeo and Juliet, Act 2, scene 2

Part I: Introduction

“What is in a name?” What kind of influence does a text’s title or designation have over the way we teach it or read it? Do names of texts govern the way we read and interpret the identified fragments or works? And how does the name we assign a text determine the way later generations of scholars classify the texts? Does the designation of a particular text determine its interpretation, reception or inclusion in existing authoritative canons or collections? Does it compromise or enable the integration of such a text into an already established corpus, e.g., the biblical corpus?

In writing this article we would like to review the history of Dead Sea Scrolls nomenclature and reflect on the processes of identification of compositions and fragments. In this process we will discuss three overlapping aspects of the naming process: (1) the identification of fragments, texts and works, (2) the categorization of identified texts as canonical or non-canonical, i.e., apocryphal or pseudepigraphic and, (3) the genre designation of the identified scrolls. It is our goal to identify the problems and challenges of scroll-naming and to offer some preliminary directions for the renaming, reclassifying and rethinking of the scrolls.

In what follows we will offer a brief overview of the ways scrolls were named in the early stages of scrolls study. We have begun to trace the integration of the scrolls into old and established frameworks that were defined by both canon (such as biblical, nonbiblical, pseudepigraphic, and apocryphal) and genre (such as wisdom, apocalypse, liturgy, and law). These initial stages of reading and interpretation were essential for the establishment of the field of scrolls studies. However, we would like to rethink and problematize that initial integra-

¹Part of this essay was first presented at the 2013 IOQS meeting under the title, “What is in a Name?” The authors of this essay wish to acknowledge the comments and suggestions to that earlier oral version by Paul Franks, Reinhard Kratz, Jean-Sébastien Rey, and Emanuel Tov.

tion into biblical studies in light of the development and advances of the fields of scrolls scholarship and related fields.

Since the discovery of the scrolls in the middle of the 20th century, there have been dramatic and significant transformations. Initially scholars located the scrolls in a canonical context, but it is now clear that the scrolls were produced prior to the canonization of the Hebrew Bible. Moreover, there have been significant developments in genre theory² that have taught us much about how to classify and categorize texts from antiquity. We have learned to think beyond the confines of what has been called post-exilic, or second temple, or even ancient Judaism. Moreover we have come to understand that the period in which the scrolls were produced was a time of textual pluriformity and not one of fixity. We rarely encounter a straightforward situation in which a composition had only one textform, which is found in discrete manuscripts, and which is known by only one name. Instead, we have compositions with different textforms, collections with varying forms, and fragments of documents that might not have had specific names in antiquity. For example, 1QS seems to have been called “סרך היחד,” or perhaps “ספר סרך היחד,” and this term is found at the very beginning of both 4Q255 (4QS^a) and 1QS (only partly preserved), and written as title on a fragment deriving from the outer part of the 1QS scroll. 1QS is a collection, and its main part, beginning with 1QS 5, is indicated with the heading: “וזה הסרך לאנשי היחד,” a phrase which is formally comparable to the heading of 1QSa in the same collection: “וזה הסרך לכול עדת ישראל.” However, a variant version of 1Q5 in 4Q258 (see also 4Q256) has the heading “מדרש למשביל לאנשי התורה.” For whatever reason, variant collections preserved related but non-identical textforms, but had two different headings, and perhaps also two different names.

We could not rationally aspire to achieve in this essay comprehensive solutions to the questions and problems we are raising. Nevertheless, we hope that, by discussing the history of nomenclature, we can begin to sharpen our own thinking about how to read, classify, interpret, and transmit the scrolls in the larger context of Judaism in antiquity.

We begin with John Strugnell’s own retrospective corrections and reflections towards the end of his career. In his article, “Moses-Pseudepigrapha at Qumran: 4Q375, 4Q376, and Similar Works,”³ Strugnell points out that many of the presuppositions connected to sectarianism, classification and nomenclature needed to be reconsidered. He acknowledged that he would need to rethink his earlier work, including the way in which he had named, identified and categorized texts. He wrote about his own earlier commentaries on these Moses-

²M. M. Bakhtin, *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays* (trans. V. W. McGee; Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986), 78; T. Todorov, “The Origin of Genres,” *New Literary History* 8:1 (Autumn 1976): 159–70; A. Rosmarin, *The Power of Genre* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1985); J. Farrell, “Classical Genre in Theory and Practice,” *New Literary History* 34:3 (Summer 2003): 383–408; H. Najman, “The Idea of Biblical Genre,” in *Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honor of Eileen Schuller on the Occasion of Her 65th Birthday* (ed. J. Penner, K. M. Penner, and C. Wassen; STDJ 98; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 308–21.

³J. Strugnell, “Moses-Pseudepigrapha at Qumran: 4Q375, 4Q376, and Similar Works,” in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (ed. L. H. Schiffman; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 221–56.

pseudepigrapha, “They asked all the questions that scholars were accustomed to ask in 1975, but were they failing to ask others that have now come to the forefront of scholarly attention?”⁴ He recognized that he himself and early generations of scholars had been looking for what was familiar. They found texts that they could identify as canonical, and they identified noncanonical texts as pseudonymous or apocryphal. And they placed texts that did not fit into those already known categories into the category of Essene or sectarian writings. But what else could they have done?

Part II: Naming compositions

II.1 Designating Names for Scrolls

At times, names can refer to compositions, but sometimes they refer to scrolls, to sections of compositions or scrolls, or to fragments.⁵ Over the course of the publication history, names have often changed. Sometimes, they changed because the editorial team used preliminary names, which were changed in the official *DJD* editions. In other cases, manuscript names changed because fragments or manuscripts were identified as belonging to a certain composition only after they had been published and had been given an official name. In still other cases, the English translations of the French titles in certain *DJD* volumes differed from the original French ones.⁶ On the whole, the names given in the *DJD* series and then presented in *DJD* 39 and in the subsequent *Revised List*⁷ have been viewed as authoritative. Earlier lists were made by Strugnell and Reed, culminating in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Catalogue* published in 1994.⁸ Though outdated and incomplete, Strugnell’s lists (to one of which we have access)⁹ and Reed’s catalogue still provide interesting data on the history of identification and naming. For detective work on earlier provisional references given by the original editorial team, one

⁴Ibid., 221.

⁵See also E. Tov, “The Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series: History and System of Presentation,” in *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (ed. E. Tov; *DJD* 39; Oxford: Clarendon, 2002), 1–25 at 10–12 (“Identifications and Nomenclature of Texts”). One should distinguish between the number (or siglum) of a manuscript, such as “4Q376”; the name of that manuscript, in this case “4QApocryphon of Moses^{b?}”; the abbreviation of that manuscript in Tov’s lists, in this case “apocrMoses^{b?}”; and the name of a composition copied in that manuscript, in this case “*Apocryphon of Moses*.” The list of names includes names with “Fragment” (e.g., 4Q478 Fragment Mentioning Festivals), “Text” (e.g., 1Q30 Liturgical Text A), “Work” (e.g., 4Q185 Sapiential Work), “Composition” (4Q471 Narrative and Poetic Composition), and “Scroll” (as in Copper Scroll, but also 4Q471 War-Scroll Like Text B).

⁶Cf., e.g., 5Q10 *Écrit avec citations de Malachie* which was changed into *apocrMal*.

⁷E. Tov, *Revised Lists of the Texts from the Judaean Desert* (Leiden: Brill, 2010). Henceforth: *RL*.

⁸Stephen A. Reed, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Catalogue: Documents, Photographs and Museum Inventory Numbers* (ed. Marilyn Lundberg; SBLRBS 32; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994). Henceforth: Reed. Both Reed and *RL* present the sigla used in Card Concordance. For a convenient listing see Reed, 529–41.

⁹“Catalog of the Dead Sea Scrolls - (Arranged according to Sigla)” (unpublished computer printout dated 27/04/85, with later additions and corrections written in different hands).

should consult the tags on the PAM photographs, which sometimes give names that are not recorded elsewhere.¹⁰

II.2 Preserved Titles

What do we know about the titles of ancient Jewish compositions? In general, such titles may be derived from an incipit (such as “בראשית” for the first book of Moses); may be a reference to the overall subject matter of a work (which may be the case with the title “דברי המארות”); may consist of a genre characterization (as possibly in the case of the title “סרך היחד”); or may connect the book to a specific figure (e.g., “ספר מושה”).¹¹ When the titles are not found on the verso of a scroll, they can sometimes be deduced from the opening words of a composition. Below is a list of scrolls with titles on the verso, or probable titles in the preserved beginnings.¹²

Ms	Title	Comments	modern title
1QM	or [ה ספר סרך] המלחמה ל[משכיל סרך] המלחמה	possible title, but broken	<i>War Scroll</i>
1QS	ס[ר]ך היחד	verso	<i>Serekh ha-Yahad</i>
4Q255	... [ספר סרך היחד]		
4Q258	מדרש למשכיל לאנשי התורה		
1QSa	וזה הסרך לכול עדת ישראל		<i>Serekh ha-Edah</i>
1Qsb	דרבי ברכה למשכיל		<i>Blessings</i>
4Q180	פשר על הקצים		<i>Ages of Creation A</i>
4Q242	מלי צלתא די צלי נבני מלך בבל		<i>Prayer of Nabonidus</i>
4Q298	[דבר]י משכיל אשר דבר לכול בני שחר		<i>Words of the Sage to the Sons of Dawn</i>
4Q401	למשכיל ש[יר עולת השבת] ¹³	beginning?	<i>Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice</i>
4Q434	ברכי נפשי את אדוני		<i>Barkhi Nafshi</i>
4Q529	מלי כתבא די אמר מיכאל		<i>Words of Michael</i>

¹⁰One such example is PAM 43.425 which refers to 4Q180 as “pAzazel”

¹¹The four examples are found on fragments which (seem to) come from the beginnings of Qumran scrolls, as manuscript titles of scrolls or compositions: 4Q8 reads ברשית; the title דברי המארות is on 4Q504 8 verso; a fragment which seems to come from the 1QS-Sa-Sb scroll preserves [סרך היחד ומן] (the מן may introduce the other parts of the scroll), while 4Q249 originally read ספר מושה. The text on the verso of 4Q257 is barely legible, and might or might not represent a title. Cf. on titles also briefly J. Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4 XXIV: Sapiential Texts, Part 2: Instruction (4QMūsār I Mēvîn): 4Q415ff* (DJD 34; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 3 n. 1.

¹²Adopted from E. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 103–4.

¹³The reconstruction is based on the heading of other songs in the same composition.

4Q543	פרשגן כתב מלי חזות עמרם	cf. also 4Q545	<i>Vision of Amram</i>
4Q249	מדרש מושה	on verso, corrected from ספר מושה! ¹⁴	<i>Midrash [Sefer] Moshe</i>
4Q504	דברי המארות	on verso	<i>Words of the Luminaries</i>

II.3 Hebrew Names Assigned to Scrolls

Other Hebrew names were offered by editors of manuscripts as generic or content designations for the compositions, sometimes based on words used in the text.¹⁵ Milik's comment in DJD 1 may suggest that he assigned Hebrew names to those texts which he considered Essene or sectarian, while he used French or English titles for those texts which he regarded as nonsectarian.

אות or *Otot*, signs (4Q319). The word אות, "sign," is found repeatedly in the text, and can be used as a content designation, since large parts of the text consist of 'otot lists.¹⁶

ברכות or *Berakhot* (Ber; 4Q286–290) is a generic designation which signals liturgy. The text consists of blessings and curses, and uses the verb ברך a few times, as well as the plural noun ברכות.¹⁷

דברי מושה or *Dires de Moïse* (1Q22 = 1QDM). The name characterizes the content, but does not appear at the beginning of the text. See discussion below.

הודיות or *Hodayot* was proposed by Sukenik as a designation because many of the hymns begin with אודך אדנוי, "I praise you Lord."¹⁸

הלכה or *Halakha* (4Q251; 4Q264a; 4Q472a) is a content designation, based on the later rabbinic use of the term, even though the word does not appear at all in the Dead Sea Scrolls.¹⁹

¹⁴Cf. the forthcoming publication by J. Ben-Dov and D. Stoeckl Ben Ezra.

¹⁵Other Hebrew titles were used provisionally, but not in the official editions, such as *Dibre maskil libne sahar* (siglum: DS) for 4Q298; *Serekh ha-Niddot* (Sndt; 4Q284) or *Tehillot ha-'Avot* (4Q382). See also the Aramaic titles as reflected in the sigla of the Card Concordance: *ḥazut 'Amram* (4Q543–547), *k'ṭab Mika'el* (4Q529), *molad No'h* (4Q533).

¹⁶Published by J. Ben-Dov in *Qumran Cave 4 XVI: Calendrical Texts* (DJD 21; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 195–244. In his discussion in *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), 61–69, J. T. Milik furnishes no name, referring to the text as "fragments of a calendar in a copy of the *Rule of the Community*" (61), but in Strugnell's 1985 list, the text is called "*Otot*."

¹⁷Published by B. Nitzan in *Qumran Cave 4 VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts: Part 1* (DJD 11; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 1–74. The name "*Berakhot*" was already given at an early stage, as is clear from the tag on PAM 41.589 (taken in 1955).

¹⁸E. L. Sukenik, *Oṣar hamegillot hagenuzot šebyade ha'universiṭa ha'ibrit* (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1954), 34.

¹⁹4Q251 (4QHalakha A), 4Q264a (4QHalakha B), and 4Q472a (4QHalakha C) were all published in *Qumran Cave 4 XXV: Halakhic Texts* (DJD 35; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), but none of the editors elaborates on the names assigned to the manuscripts. The name of 4Q251 goes back to J. T. Milik, who already referred to it as "4QHalakha in *Les petites grottes de Qumrân*" (DJD 3; Oxford: Clarendon, 1962), 300. See also the tag "Halakhic" on PAM 42.409–42.411 (taken in 1957).

טהורות or *Tohorot* (4Q274; 4Q276–278) is a content designation (“purity laws”) that occurs repeatedly (in the singular) in the text of 4Q274.²⁰ Or, alternatively, סרד הטהורות.²¹

מוסר למבין or *Mūsār lē Mēvîn, Instruction for a Maven* (4Q415–418; 4Q423; 1Q26) is the alternative name suggested by Strugnell for (4Q) *Instruction*, on the grounds that the admonitions of the text are directed to a מבין or מבין, and מוסר can indicate a wisdom composition.²²

מקצת מעשי התורה or *Miqṣat Ma‘aśe Ha-Torah* (MMT; 4Q394–399), *Some precepts of the Torah*, is the title given by the editors, Qimron and Strugnell, and taken from the epilogue (C27), on the grounds that the epilogue refers back to the heading of the second part (B1): אלה מקצת דברינו, *these are some of our rulings*.²³

משמרות or *Mishmarot, (priestly) watches*, was originally introduced as a generic designation referring to form (rosters) and content (priestly services) by Milik,²⁴ even though the word itself does not appear in the text.²⁵

ספר המלחמה or *Sefer ha-Milḥamah* (4Q285; 11Q14). This title was chosen “to indicate the close relationship to, but independence of, 1QM (*Megillat ha-Milḥamah*).”²⁶

תנחומים or *Tanḥûmîm, consolations* (Tanh; 4Q176). The given title of the work is derived from the text itself which introduces in a new paragraph the citations from (Deutero-)Isaiah with the words “and from the book of Isaiah: consolations”

II.4 Names that Identify Scrolls as Secondary to Biblical Books²⁷

²⁰Published by J. M. Baumgarten in *Qumran Cave 4 XXV: Halakhic Texts* (DJD 35; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999). At some point also 4Q275 (4QCommunal Ceremony) and 4Q279 (4QFour Lots), both published by P. S. Alexander and G. Vermes in *Qumran Cave 4 XIX: Serekh ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts* (DJD 26; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), had been preliminarily entitled *Tohorot*, but in an earlier stage Milik called 4Q274 *Tohora, A* (cf. the tag on PAM 43.309, taken in 1960), and some of the other ones differently, such as *Halakh.-Sect.* (tags on 42.412 and 42.413).

²¹J. T. Milik, “Milkî-šedeq et Milkî-reša‘ dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens,” *JJS* 23 (1972):95–144, at 129, who refers to 4Q274 through 4Q282 as “Règle de la pureté” and *serek ha-ṭharôt*.

²²See the long discussion of the proposed title by J. Strugnell in DJD 34:3. Previously, the work was provisionally called *Sapiential Work A*.

²³J. Strugnell and E. Qimron, *Qumran Cave 4 V: Miqṣat Ma‘aśe Ha-Torah* (DJD 10; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 1, 110.

²⁴J. T. Milik, “Le travail d’édition des manuscrits du désert de Juda,” in *Volume du Congrès Strasbourg 1956* (ed. P. A. H. de Boer; VTSup 4; Leiden: Brill, 1957), 17–26 at 24 (“un groupe de mss. de 4Q auxquels a été donné le titre général de Mišmarot”). Correspondingly, the 1957 photographs of these texts have “Mišm” on the tags.

²⁵For a discussion of the term, see S. Talmon with J. Ben-Dov in DJD 35, 8–13.

²⁶See the edition of 4Q285 by G. Vermes and P. Alexander in *Qumran Cave 4 XXVI Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1* (DJD 36; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 231, as well as 232 n. 1, which refers to a series of earlier names, including *Berakot-Milḥama* (as on the tag of PAM 43.325), long before A. S. van der Woude published 11Q14 as 11QBer in “Ein neuer Segensspruch aus Qumran (11QBer),” in *Bibel und Qumran: Beiträge zur Erforschung der Beziehungen zwischen Bibel- und Qumranwissenschaft: Hans Bardtke zum 22.9.1966* (ed. S. Wagner; Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1968), 253–58.

²⁷Here we will not discuss the question to what extent excerpted biblical texts or biblical texts with additions or literary variants (vis-à-vis the Masoretic Text) should have the same name as other biblical texts.

There are also names for scrolls that relate to biblical books. Here we have in mind titles using *peshet* or commentary. This will in turn raise a series of problems about the nature of commentary and about different kinds of *peshet*. DJD 1 proposed the use of the siglum p (= *peshet*) for commentaries. In DJD 1, 3, and 5, running *pesharim* were all published under the name “Commentaire de...” or “Commentary on,” but also referred to as *pesharim*, using an abbreviated *p* followed by the name of a book, e.g., *pIsa*, *pHos*, etc. On the other hand, the texts that were preliminarily referred to as “*Peshet (on) Genesis*” have been officially renamed “*Commentary on Genesis*.”²⁸ The misnomer for 4Q247, *Peshet on the Apocalypse of Weeks*, further confuses the matter. In a similar vein, abbreviations for “apocryphal” or “Apocryphon” were coupled with names of biblical books, e.g., in the present lists: *Genesis Apocryphon* (1QapGen); *apocrLam A and B* (4Q179; 4Q501); *apocrDan* (4Q246); *apocrPent A and B* (4Q368; 4Q377); *apocrJosh* (4Q378; 4Q379; Mas1); *apocrJer A, B, C* (4Q383; 4Q384; 4Q385a; 4Q387; 4Q387a; 4Q388a; 4Q389; 4Q390); *Apocr. Psalm and Prayer* (4Q448); *apocrMal* (5Q10); *apocrSam-Kgs* (6Q9); *apocrPs* (11Q11); *apocrGen* (Mas1m).

Additionally, scholars used the prefix “pseudo” with names of biblical books, e.g., “*Pseudo-Ezekiel*.” Confusingly, however, in the case of, e.g., *Pseudo-Daniel*, the “pseudo” designation may refer, not to the book, but rather to the figure of Daniel. Similarly, texts whose names begin with “Apocryphon of,” “Testament of,” “Prayer of,” “Vision of,” “Text Mentioning,” and “Prophecy of” are then connected with names of figures such as Enosh, Enoch, Noah, Melchizedek, Jacob, Rachel, Judah (or alternatively Benjamin), Naphtali, Joseph, Levi, Kohath, Amram, Moses, Joshua, Samson, Elisha, David, Zedekiah, Jeremiah and Daniel, but it is not always clear when the reference is to a figure and when it is to a book associated with that figure.²⁹

Other designations have also been coupled with names of biblical books. For example, paraphrase: 4Q123 “4QpaleoParaJoshua” or “paleo paraJosh”; 4Q127 “pap4QParaExodus gr”; 4Q382: “4Qpap paraKings et al”; 4Q422: “Paraphrase of Genesis and Exodus.” 4Q158 was originally named *Biblical Paraphrase: Genesis and Exodus*, but was then renamed using the *RP* (*Reworked Pentateuch*) designation, also used for 4Q364-367. The “Targum” designation, abbreviated tg., has been used for 4Q156, 4Q157, and 11Q10. This is another example of nomenclature guided by familiarity. These texts are translations into Aramaic, but does it follow that they have any relation to what later comes to be called Targum? Similarly, any translation into Greek has been designated “LXX.” Other texts have not been classified as interpretations or translations, but have nevertheless been identified in terms of their relationship to biblical texts, such as *Text Related to Genesis* (6Q19).

²⁸The name *Peshet on Genesis* is still attested in Strugnell’s 1985 list, but Reed’s catalogue lists the alternative *Commentary on Genesis*. G. J. Brooke, in his 4Q252 edition in *Qumran Cave 4 XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), argues, at 187, that “because of the variety of its contents, 4Q252 is here labelled generically with the somewhat neutral term ‘commentary’; only part of it is *peshet* in the strict sense.”

²⁹H. Najman, *Losing the Temple and Recovering the Future: An Analysis of 4 Ezra*, chapter 2 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

The differences between many of those designations are not always clear. What was “Paraphrase” becomes “Reworked.” What was “Pseudo” sometimes becomes “Apocryphon” or “Apocryphal” (and sometimes vice versa). Some terms are not only used in connection to biblical books, but also to *Jubilees* and *Enoch*. This goes for the so-called “Pseudo-Jubilees” manuscripts (or rather fragments), some of which might be directly dependent on *Jubilees*, or on traditions that were also incorporated in *Jubilees*. Milik used *Pseudo-Enoch* in a loose sense for the *Book of Giants* before he realized the relationship to the Manichean *Kawān*.³⁰

II. 5 Genres

Additionally, there are generic designations that connect the scrolls with already established and recognizable biblical genres or forms, such as “Beatitude,” “Vision,” “Prayer,” “Poetry,” “Hymns,” “Narrative,” “Lament,” “Instruction,” “Liturgical,” “Sapiential,” and “Apocalypse”; with later Christian genres, such as “Catena,” “Florilegium,” “Testimonia,” or “Ordo”; with other ancient or scientific forms, “Zodiology and Brontology,” “Horoscope,” and “Calendrical.” A few Hebrew designations also refer to nonbiblical genres, such as סדר, מדרש³¹, פשר, שיר, תהלה and ברכה. The terms סדר and פשר have been used especially for those texts which were seen as sectarian. No attempts have been made to define these genres or to justify or problematize the use of generic terms in general.

II.6 Apocrypha

A persistent and complicated problem is the use of the words *Apocryphon* and *Apocryphal*, often with the primary meaning of “nonbiblical” text connected with a biblical figure or relating events from biblical times. One can voice several arguments against the use of this word. First, although the term has generally been used to designate texts that have less authority than those in the canon, Catholics and Protestants use the term differently. Secondly, in modern scholarship the word “apocrypha” is used vaguely to denote a large group of books that are noncanonical, anonymous or pseudonymous, but that do not otherwise share characteristics. Thirdly, throughout scholarship, the terms apocryphal and pseudepigraphic have often been interchanged. This use of the term is therefore anachronistic as well as imprecise. At best it is not very useful, and at worst it is detrimental to scholarship. In many cases it is hardly clear why editors chose to give this name, other than that a work probably reminded them of texts that were already called “apocryphal.”

Part III. Nomenclature in Select DJD Volumes

³⁰Cf., e.g., Milik, *Books of Enoch*, vi: “I succeeded in identifying various ‘pseudo-Enochic’ manuscripts of 4Q ... as forming part of an important Enochic work, the Book of Giants.” See also the sigla for 4Q530–532 in the Concordance: psHenA, psHenB, and psHenC.

³¹A. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a-b})* (STDJ 13; Leiden: Brill, 1994). A. M. Habermann, *Megilloth Midbar Yehuda: The Scrolls from the Judean Desert* (Israel: Machbaroth lesifrut, 1959), 173 also referred to 4Q174 1-2 i as מדרש על אחרית הימים.

We do not intend this section to be exhaustive, but rather characteristic of the inconsistency and sometimes haphazard nature of early scholarly nomenclature of fragments and larger works. We do not intend to criticize earlier generations, who were confronted with major problems that they were in no position to address systematically, but rather to help clarify the ongoing challenges and difficulties that lay before us today. The purpose of this section is to illustrate the messiness of the problems so that we can begin to rethink the nomenclature in a new and tidier way.

III.1 DJD 1

Let us turn to DJD 1, published in 1955.³² This volume, in which Barthélemy edited the biblical manuscripts and 1QSa, and Milik the other ones, provides some early insights in the criteria offered for naming. The *tables des sigles* provides the subheading *Titres d'ouvrages*, which distinguishes between *ouvrages canoniques* and *ouvrages non canoniques*, and distinguishes the latter in three categories, namely *Commentaires*: désignés par le sigle p (= *peshet*); *Apocryphes*; *les ouvrages nouveaux de la 'Bibliothèque Essénienne'*.³³ For the latter they propose the first letter of the known or supposed Hebrew title. This already illustrates the three central points discussed above. The earliest titles reflect scholarly assumptions that the identified works fit into existing categories, as well as theological and sociological assumptions about the community that produced the scrolls.

At the earliest stages of naming, texts were designated as “Essene” (or “sectarian”) writings, such as the following: “1QS,” “1QSa,” “1QSB,” “1QM,” “1QH,” “CD” and “6QD.” In contrast, examples designated as apocryphal texts were texts such as: “1QLamech,” “1QJub,” “1QLevi,” “4QLevi,” “1QDM” (“Dires de Moïse”), “1QMyst.”

Although the distinctions between “Apocrypha” and “Essene” are not explained or consistently maintained in DJD 1, there are nevertheless some discussions of both nomenclature and characterization. For example, in DJD 1:92 there is a brief discussion of 1Q22 *Dires de Moïse*: “Le titre français, choisi conventionnellement, a l'avantage de s'accorder au sigle: 1QDM(oše), donné en fonction du titre hypothétique hébreu: דברי משה. On aurait pu prendre aussi bien ‘Petit Deutéronome’ (cf. ‘Petite Genèse’ pour Jubilés), ce qui aurait souligné la dépendance de l'apocryphe à l'égard du livre biblique: son cadre fictif et son style analogues à ceux du Deutéronome.” This discussion is particularly important because of the mentioned affinity between 1Q22 and *Jubilees*. Because of its multiple copies, *Jubilees* is one of a few texts, in addition to the biblical corpus, that have served as points of reference for decades of scrolls scholarship.

Let us consider four more texts from Cave 1.

³²D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik, *Qumran Cave 1* (DJD 1; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955). Abbreviated as DJD 1.

³³DJD 1:46-47

In DJD 1:100, 1Q25 is named “une prophétie apocryphe.” There is a brief discussion about whether the text is a commentary on Ps 107 (as suggested by Rabinowitz) or “un ouvrage attribué à un prophète.” The discussions and the evaluating discussions betray the unresolved questions concerning the time in which the scrolls were produced. Were there already commentaries on biblical books? Was it still possible to write new biblical books?

Milik called 1Q26 “un apocryphe.” What does it mean to designate a text an apocryphon? In DJD 1:102, we read: “ces fragments pourraient appartenir au genre des Testaments et des Instructions, en style deutéronomique et sapientiel.” To say that the text is composed in a deuteronomistic and wisdom style suggests that the text is imitating biblical texts. Or it could be an even stronger statement, namely, that the text aspires to biblical status. Moreover, what does it mean to locate 1Q26 within an already established genre of testament or of instruction? What concept of generic membership is operative in this formulation? Later this manuscript was identified as being a copy of *4QInstruction*, renamed to “Wisdom Apocryphon,” and ultimately to “1QInstruction.”

The next example we will consider is the much discussed 1Q27 “Livre de Mystères.” In DJD 1:103, Milik writes: “L’ouvrage appartient au genre pseudépigraphique. Il s’agit probablement des révélations d’un personnage fictif, selon toute vraisemblance d’un patriarche. ... En s’inspirant de la fréquence du mot מִסְתֵּרִים, on peut donner à cette composition le titre ‘Livre / Apocalypse des Mystères.’” It is really unclear how Milik is using the term “genre” or why he refers to this text as pseudépigraphic rather than apocryphal. The naming of the text is based on the use of the term *raz*. There is of course a later kabbalistic work known as *Sefer haRazim*. Perhaps Milik knew of this work and meant to connect the Scrolls to later kabbalistic trends in Judaism.

Our final DJD 1 example is 1Q34 Recueil de prières liturgiques. The tentative title was proposed on the basis of the formula תפלה ליום כפורים, discussed in DJD 1:136. Here we see an example of the naming of a text based upon a generalization from a formula used within the text itself. Milik assumed that the fragment was part of a much larger corpus of liturgical prayers and that 1Q34 was one of several prayers linked to particular holidays.

III.2 DJD 3

It is helpful at this point to turn to Baillet’s use of the term “apocryphe” in DJD 3. Here is a long list of Baillet’s apocryphal designations: 2Q21 Un apocryphe de Moïse (?); 2Q22 Un apocryphe de David (?); 2Q23 Une prophétie apocryphe; 3Q5 Une prophétie apocryphe; 3Q7 Un apocryphe mentionnant l’ange de la Présence; 6Q8 Un apocryphe de la Genèse; 6Q9 Un apocryphe de Samuel-Rois; 6Q12 Une prophétie apocryphe. Although Baillet often uses the designation “apocryphe,”⁸⁴ at times he simply uses “texte” as the designation. Why Baillet designated some as “texte” and other identified fragments or works as “apocryphe” is never discussed in DJD 3.

⁸⁴Cf. also 4Q488, Un apocryphe en araméen, published by Baillet in *Qumran Grotte 4 III* (DJD 7; Oxford: Clarendon, 1987).

Somewhat illuminating is the comparison between 3Q7 *Un apocryphe mentionnant l'ange de la Présence* and 3Q8 *Un text mentionnant un ange de paix (?)*. In the notes to 3Q7 (DJD 3:99) Baillet suggests that the few fragments might belong to a source of the Greek *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. This might have been the reason for the use of “apocryphe” rather than “texte.” More generally, “apocryphe” seems to be used for any nonbiblical narrative text related to the Hebrew Bible. It is interesting but somewhat bewildering that in DJD 3 Milik did not use the designation “apocryphe,” although he used it extensively elsewhere.

III.3 DJD 5

DJD 5 differs from earlier volumes in the ways in which it is problematic.³⁵ Several of the manuscripts are not named and one title is incorrect.³⁶ In addition to these problems, DJD 5 does not give names to the following: 4Q178 (in Reed and *RL* it is incorrectly called: Unclassified frags.); 4Q181 (in Reed “AgesCreat”; in *RL* called Ages of Creation B); 4Q183 (in Reed called: “historical work”; in *RL* “MidrEschat^e?”); 4Q184 (in Allegro’s preliminary edition,³⁷ and in Reed and *RL*: Wiles of the Wicked Woman); 4Q185 (in Reed and *RL*: Sapiential work); 4Q186 (in Reed and *RL*: Horoscope).

In his *RevQ* 26 review article Strugnell comments on some of the names. On 4Q158 *Biblical Paraphrase: Genesis-Exodus*, Strugnell writes: “on peut contester le bien-fondé du titre; de larges sections ne donnent que le texte biblique, inchangé.”³⁸ However, Strugnell gives no alternative. Similarly he writes the following on the nomenclature of the following fragments:

- 4Q159 Ordinances: “mieux vaut ne plus utiliser ce titre moderne.”³⁹
- 4Q160 The Vision of Samuel: “on pourrait douter que ce mot « vision » soit valable pour tout l’ouvrage. Il appartient au genre de narration apocryphe avec prières et discours (tous de Samuel?) ajoutés au texte biblique.”⁴⁰
- 4Q174 Florilegium and 4Q177 Catena (A): these titles “me semblent inexacts.”⁴¹
- 4Q180 Ages of Creation: “Le titre « The Ages of Creation » ne convient qu’au fragment 1, l. 1–5, et serait à abandonner.”⁴²

³⁵J. M. Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4 I* (DJD 5; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968); J. Strugnell, “Notes en marge du volume V des « Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan »,” *RevQ* 7/26 (1970): 163–276.

³⁶The latter is 4Q172 “Commentaries on unidentified texts,” which brings together fragments which Allegro thought might belong to either 4Q161, 4Q166, 4Q167, or 4Q171. A better term would have been “Unidentified commentary fragments.” See also Strugnell on 4Q172 on p. 183 n. 17.

³⁷J. M. Allegro, “The Wiles of the Wicked Woman: A Sapiential Work from Qumran’s Fourth Cave,” *PEQ* 96 (1964): 53–55

³⁸Strugnell, “Notes en marge,” 168.

³⁹*Ibid.*, 175.

⁴⁰*Ibid.*, 179.

⁴¹*Ibid.*, 220.

⁴²*Ibid.*, 252

Here we see that Strugnell was constantly engaged in rethinking the nomenclature of the scrolls. It is essential that we embrace the same openness and continue to rethink the pre-suppositions and expectations of the first and second generation of scrolls scholars.

III.4 DJD 28

In DJD 28, VanderKam and Brady published two of the manuscripts (4Q368 and 4Q377) of Strugnell's lot as "*4QApocryphal Pentateuch A and B*," which Strugnell previously had named "*Pentateuchal Apocryphon* resp. *Apocryphal Moses (C)*." The editors discuss the contents, and the possible titles in some detail.⁴³ They acknowledge that Moses is the central figure in both works, but emphasize the different literary perspectives (Moses speaking; third person narrative about Moses), which may be why they avoid the name "Apocryphon of Moses." On the other hand, some fragments are almost identical to biblical texts, but overall the correspondence is less closely than with the *Reworked Pentateuch* manuscripts. Apparently, the choice for "*Apocryphal Pentateuch*" reflects the idea that these texts are located somewhere in between "*Reworked Pentateuch*" and "*Apocryphon of Moses*."

In the same DJD 28 composition, Schuller and Bernstein renamed a series of works that were initially called "*Joseph apocryphon*" with the very nondescript name "4QNarrative and Poetic Composition."⁴⁴ The identification also includes 2Q22, which Baillet had called "Un apocryphe de David (?)." The problem the editors refer to is the diversity of the material comprising the different manuscripts, which might suggest (1) a composition with diverse materials; (2) a misidentification of fragments of one or more of those manuscripts; (3) different manuscripts or compositions using in part the same material.⁴⁵ Clearly, the editors try to steer away from any title, including "*Apocryphon*," that could reflect a specific interpretation of the texts.

III.5 DJD 30

The title of DJD 30, edited by Dimant, is *Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts*.⁴⁶ The subtitle *Pseudo-Prophetic Texts* is remarkable since Dimant herself explains that the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C* should not be called "*Pseudo-Jeremiah*" (which was for some period Strugnell's designation⁴⁷). Dimant explains that among the many fragments and manuscripts in this volume "two works are involved: *Pseudo-Ezekiel*, attached to the figure and prophecies of the prophet Ezekiel, and *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C*, attached to the figure of the prophet Je-

⁴³J. VanderKam and M. Brady in *Wadi Daliyeh II: The Samaria Papyri from Wadi Daliyeh; and Qumran Cave 4 XXVIII: Miscellanea, Part 2* (DJD 28; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001). Discussion of contents and name of 4Q368 on p. 134, and of 4Q377 on pp. 207–8.

⁴⁴Note that in between 1985 (Strugnell's lists) and 1994 (Reed's catalogue) numbers of manuscripts in the 4Q370–379 range have changed.

⁴⁵E. Schuller and M. Bernstein, in DJD 28:151–52.

⁴⁶D. Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4 XXI: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2001).

⁴⁷On the earlier names, see Dimant, *ibid.*, 2–3.

remiah. The two compositions differ noticeably with regard to style and content. While the fragments assigned to *Pseudo-Ezekiel* mention Ezekiel by name, rewrite some of his canonical prophecies, and strive to imitate his scriptural style, those assigned to *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C* draw mainly on Deuteronomy and Jeremiah.”⁴⁸ Apparently, for Dimant, a “pseudo- text” is one that *imitates canonical* literature. However, her assumptions of an early canon and of a fixed canonical text are never justified.

III.6. DJD 34

Above (in II.3.) we noted that Strugnell in his DJD 34 introduction to the edition of *4QInstruction*, proposed the title מוסר למבין or *Mūsār l' Mēvîn, Instruction for a Maven*. In addition he also considered various alternatives such as *The Great Instruction*, or תורה למבין.⁴⁹ Noteworthy are the comments in a footnote where he proposes to return to Milik’s suggestion “to give to groups of fragments from Qumran titles in Hebrew or Aramaic in a form that could conceivably have been the ancient title of whole works.” He criticizes such misnomers as *Liturgy of Three Tongues of Fire* (based on שלוש לשונות אש in 1Q29 2 3). However, his suggestion to call it a “Mosaic Pseudepigraphon” still does not provide a Hebrew title.

III.7 DJD 39

In DJD 39, Tov included a section called: “Identifications and Nomenclature of Texts,” which is the most extensive discussion of the topic, and contributes to the understanding of the history and the DJD system of the nomenclature.⁵⁰ He calls attention to the problems of identifying fragmentary manuscripts as copies of the same composition, for example, “different manuscripts of the same Qumran composition, edited by different scholars and published by them with different titles, were sometimes renamed, while some confusion inevitable remains.”⁵¹ Examples are “4Q158” which first was called “Biblical Paraphrase” and which was renamed “Re-worked Pentateuch” by Tov, and 1Q26 which was republished and renamed “1QInstruction.” Also “many names of individual works were revised between the preliminary and final publications [in DJD] ... most names were changed because a better (or at least different) understanding of the composition has been attained ... many of the names which were one generic have now been made more specific.”⁵²

Tov adds that though “several identifications and names are contested ... the names used in *DJD* are conventionally used even by those who disagree with the characterization of

⁴⁸Ibid., 7. Compare also p. 91: “This group of fragments [of the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C*] neither displays any of the stylistic features or vocabulary typical of canonical Ezekiel nor imitates them, as does *Pseudo-Ezekiel*. It draws chiefly on Deuteronomy and Jeremiah.”

⁴⁹DJD 34:3.

⁵⁰DJD 39:10-12.

⁵¹DJD 39:11. See also p. 12:

⁵²DJD 39:12.

the texts in *DJD* ... The names given to the texts from the Judaean Desert are by implication subjective as they reflect the editor's understanding of the composition."⁵³

Constant throughout the history of nomenclature in the *DJD* series, and still reflected in Tov's discussion, is the problem whether names refer to compositions or manuscripts. In the system of *DJD*, "a distinction is made, subjective as it may be, between raised lower-case letters designating different copies of the same composition, such as "4QGen^b" and "4QGen^c," and upper-case letters designating independent compositions within a certain literary genre, e.g. "4QTohorot A, 4QTohorot B."⁵⁴ A major part of the subjectivity derives from the very fragmentary nature of the scrolls: it often cannot be determined whether manuscripts represent different copies of the same composition. Another part is due to the various modes of literary production of manuscripts as reflected in the scrolls, with different degrees of reworking and rewriting older materials, which challenges the traditional concept of composition and copy.

III. 8 Recent non-*DJD* Directions: Charlesworth and Qimron

Finally, a brief word is in order about the directions taken by two other recent editorial projects. At one extreme is the Charlesworth project, which depends on the *RL*, but aims at giving discrete names to most catalogue items. Where *DJD* 39 and *RL* often name an item as "Unclassified fragments," the PTS Dead Sea Scrolls project assigns names preferably based on a noun clause written on one of those fragments.⁵⁵ One of those names made its way into the *RL*, namely 4Q173a (=4Q173 frag. 5) "House of Stumbling Fragment." Overall, the present list of this project contains a fair number of problematic idiosyncracies and mistakes which hopefully will be corrected in the publications of those texts.⁵⁶ One example is the unfortunate renaming of 4Q179 from *Apocryphal Lamentations* to *PseudoLamentations*.⁵⁷

The other end is represented by Qimron, who holds back from giving names to very fragmentary manuscripts, and focuses on a small group of more substantial compositions. In Qimron's 2010 edition of the *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, he comments as follows on the names of the scrolls: "All the non-Hebrew names have been translated into Hebrew. Some of the Hebrew names begin with a word designating the work's genre, so that the various compositions belonging to a single genre will appear together in alphabetical order. For example, the titles of

⁵³Ibid.

⁵⁴*DJD* 39:27.

⁵⁵E.g., 1Q50, in *DJD* "Unclassified fragments," is called "Tree fragment," presumably on the basis of 1Q50 1 4, even though the text does not read וְהַעֵץ, but probably וְהַעֲצָמִים.

⁵⁶I have consulted the lists in *Temple Scroll and Related Documents* (The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations 7; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 407-11.

⁵⁷The entire history of renaming of 4Q179 is problematic. Initially (in the Concordance and on the tags of the PAM photographs) it was called "Lament," but Allegro published it as "Lamentations." In 1985 Strugnell recorded the item as "Laments," but in Reed's catalogue it became listed as "apocrLam A." The addition "apocr" for "apocryphal" was presumably added in order to distinguish it with the biblical book of Lamentations, and the addition "A" to avoid confusion with 4Q501 "apocrLam B," which originally was published by Baillet as "Lamentation," and recorded by Strugnell as "Lament."

works on wisdom begin with the word חוכמת; the titles of works in which events of the past are described begin with the word דברי.⁵⁸ He climbs out of the pit of the canonical-apocryphal distinction, only to be caught in the snare of genre. Interestingly, his attempt at systematic nomenclature forces him a few times to ignore titles based on the works themselves because they do not fit his criteria, e.g., the דברי ברכה of 1QSb which is redubbed “סרך הברכות.” Yet, “דברי משה” is used as a title for 1Q22, although it is unconcerned with events of the past.

There are various problems with Qimron’s editorial project, especially with his endeavour to reconstruct textual compositions with incidental disregard of material evidence. Nonetheless, Qimron should be credited for at least partly following up on Strugnell’s proposal, to give Hebrew names to compositions which cover whole works. It is a different matter whether they could conceivably have been the ancient titles of the works. This hardly seems the case with the various חוכמת titles, such as “חוכמת רז נהיה” for (4Q)*Instruction*, one of several sapiential texts which clearly avoids the term חוכמה.

Part IV. Remaining Questions and Preliminary Conclusions

It should be clear from this preliminary survey that there is little consistency in the nomenclature of the scrolls. Moreover, the continuities that are to be found are in part expressions of assumptions that precede the discovery of the scrolls. A pre-existing canon of fixed and authentically ascribed texts was assumed, and scrolls were named in relation to this construct. Scrolls that sufficiently resemble familiar texts are named as versions of these canonical or known but apocryphal texts, while related but non-identical texts are named as commentaries or apocryphal versions of familiar texts. Scrolls falling into neither category are named in terms suggested either by the texts themselves, or in generic terms.

However, one of the contributions of scrolls research has been to undermine exactly this picture of a primordial canon of fixed and authentically attributed texts. While some texts were surely more authoritative than others, and while some may have been generally accepted as authoritative, we can no longer assume that there was any agreed upon canon at this early date. Nor can we assume that any fixed text was agreed upon, even in the case of the most widely accepted texts. What sense does it make, then, to identify some texts as biblical and others as apocryphal or pseudepigraphic? Or to assume that “reworked” or “rewritten” texts are less authoritative than the versions familiar to us? Or even that these texts are “reworked” or “rewritten” at all, as opposed to being members of a family of traditions in which there is a great deal of variation?

If we permit ourselves to imagine the possibilities of rewriting and expansion in late Second Temple times and beyond, we can begin to rethink the presuppositions that scholars of the first two generations were unable or unwilling to jettison. So, e.g., the text now known as *Pseudo-Jubilees* could be seen as part of a larger collection of rewritten Pentateuch or interpre-

⁵⁸E. Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: the Hebrew Writings: Volume One* (Jerusalem: Ben Zvi, 2010), xix.

tive texts that expand and develop pentateuchal narratives in a wide variety of ways, ultimately giving rise to new texts with varying degrees of authority in different communities.

Kierkegaard wrote:

“Philosophy is perfectly right in saying that life must be understood backwards. But then one forgets the other clause—that it must be lived forwards.”⁵⁹

Like philosophers, philologists understand in retrospect. There is no alternative, and the first two generations of scrolls scholars were forced to name the scrolls in light of what they thought they knew, even if this knowledge has turned out to be the artifact of a later age. But we run the risk of forgetting that the texts are part of a continuous, dynamic and vital tradition that was lived forwards. Members of the *yahad* – as well as other Jews living and writing in antiquity – were exploring a multiplicity of possible continuations of the traditions that they had inherited. The fact that many of these ways of continuing died out for various reasons should not blind us to the fact that they were possible. We should not allow our understanding of the vitality of ancient Judaism to be shaped by those elements that survived and gave rise to the subject matters studied in the fields of Hebrew Bible, New Testament, Rabbinics and Early Christianity. Instead, we should embrace the opportunity to see ancient Judaism in flux, prior to the origination of these subject matters, when scriptural texts were polyform and the possibilities for development had not yet been narrowed down. Rethinking the names of many of the scrolls would be a good place to start.

⁵⁹Søren Kierkegaard, *Diary of Søren Kierkegaard* (ed. P. Rohde; trans. G. Anderson; New York: Philosophical Library, 1960), 111.